

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to conform the language of the specification with the language of the claims. Accordingly, the term "embedded" as used in the claims is now incorporated in the specification.

The Examiner has rejected significant claims in this case, essentially on the basis of being anticipated by the Millar '358 patent. Applicants have amended the rejected independent claims 38 and 65 to make explicit that it is the distal end of the linear engagement member which is embedded in one of the two end companion members.


Applicants believe that this amendment is in conformance with the suggestion by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, and Applicants believe that this amendment places the claims in condition for allowance.

This amendment has been made to the two independent claims 38 and 65 which were rejected by the Examiner. Applicants believe that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

*18 July 2006*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lloyd McAulay  
Reg. No. 20,423  
Attorney For Applicants  
Reed Smith LLP  
599 Lexington Avenue, 29 Fl.  
New York, New York 10022-7650  
(212) 521-5461  
Fax No.: (212) 521-5450  
Email: [Lmcaulay@ReedSmith.com](mailto:Lmcaulay@ReedSmith.com)